

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Office Action, Applicant affirms the election of Claims 6 through 11 for further prosecution of this application. Claims 1 through 5 have been canceled.

Pursuant to the rejection of Claims 6 through 11 in the above-referenced Office Action, Applicant presents herewith amended Claims 6 through 11, all of which have been amended to conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 and to distinguish over the prior art of record in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6 through 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite with the use of the terms "engageable" in Claims 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11. The claims presented with this amendment have been amended to positively recite the support bracket in combination with the support rail and engaged therewith and such amendments are believed to overcome this rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent 6,145,677 to Corniel. Independent Claim 6 has been amended per this amendment to recite, in combination with an elongated horizontally extending support rail of an elevator door, a support bracket connecting hoist equipment to the support rail comprising plural spaced apart hook members each including an arcuate hook part configured for snug fitting engagement with and hooked over the support rail,

and a depending shank part connected to a frame member between opposite ends of the frame member, together with a depending member connected to the frame member substantially midway between opposite ends of the frame member and including means connected to hoist equipment for movement of one of persons and material between a floor at which the elevator door is disposed and a hoistway. Dependent Claims 7 through 9 have been amended to clearly and properly depend from amended Claim 6.

Accordingly, the amendments to Claims 6 through 9 are believed to distinguish these claims over the Corniel reference. This reference discloses a clothes hanging rack or system for mounting on a fence or other vertical, somewhat planar structure characterized by spaced apart rod supports (14a, 14b and 16) which support an elongated tubular rod assembly therebetween. However, Corniel does not disclose or suggest plural spaced apart hook members interconnected by a frame member wherein the hook members include arcuate upper hook parts and depending shank parts connected to the frame member between opposite ends thereof and wherein a further depending member is connected to the frame member substantially midway between opposite ends of the frame member and including means connected to hoist equipment. Accordingly, in at least these respects, Claim 6 and the claims dependent thereon, respectively, distinguishes over the Corniel reference.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6 through 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,810,180 to Chan. The Chan reference discloses a clothes hanging device comprising two spaced apart clamp assemblies supporting an angle shaped rod which, in turn, is connected to a tubular engaging member of rod support members for supporting an elongated laundry rod. However, Chan does not disclose or suggest the provision of plural spaced apart hook members with arcuate hook parts configured for snug fitting engagement with and hooked over an elevator door support rail wherein each hook member has a depending shank part connected to a frame member between opposite ends thereof and wherein a further depending member is connected to the frame member substantially midway between opposite ends of the frame member and includes means connected to hoist equipment for an elevator hoistway. With respect to Claim 10, this claim has also been further amended to recite additional features of the retaining means mounted on respective ones of the hook members and engaged with an underside surface of the door support rail. Accordingly, since certain elements mentioned above are now recited in Claims 6 and 10 and thus also the claims dependent thereon, respectively, and such elements are not disclosed in the prior art, Claims 6 through 11 are believed to patentably distinguish over the disclosure of the Chan reference.

Appl. Ser. No. 10/629,974
Amendment Dated May 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 8, 2005

Applicant has made a diligent effort to advance the prosecution of this application by amending claims and by pointing out with particularity herein how the claims, as amended, distinguish in a patentable sense. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance of Claims 6 through 11 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/09/05

Michael E. Martin
Michael E. Martin
Registration No. 24,821
Agent for Applicant

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
Phone (214) 999-3000
Fax (214) 999-3623

DALLAS 1524627v2